



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,132	12/05/2001	James M. McArdle	AUS920010929US1	8055

7590 10/04/2004

Frank C. Nicholas
CARDINAL LAW GROUP
Suite 2000
1603 Orrington Avenue
Evanston, IL 60201

EXAMINER

RAMPURIA, SATISH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2124

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/005,132

Applicant(s)

MCARDLE, JAMES M.

Examiner

Satish S. Rampuria

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/05/01.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the application filed on 12/05/2001.
2. Claims 1-16 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. An initialed and dated copy of Applicant's IDS form 1449 filed on 12/05/2001 is attached to the instant Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The claims are non-statutory because they recite components of logging the execution command, representing functional descriptive material without a computer readable medium or computer implemented method, program per se are not tangibly embodied. Claims 1-6 thus amounts to only abstract idea and are nonstatutory.

The rejection of the base claim is necessarily incorporated into the dependent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2124

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,612,898 to Huckins (hereinafter called Huckins) in view of US Publication No. 2004/0098640 to Smith (hereinafter called Smith).

Per claims 1, 4, 5, and 6:

Huckins disclose:

- A method of instrumenting logging of command execution of a command script (Abstract, “providing a debug tracing log of the execution of the client components”) comprising:
 - defining a common log file (col. 2, lines 47-48 “outputting log data to a log file”);
 - writing at least one command of a command script to the common log file (col. 2, lines 5-7 “provide a logging or debug capability for monitoring the operation of the client component”); and

Huckins does not explicitly disclose providing a parallel command string to replace the command when it contains sensitive information, prior to it being written to the common log file.

However, Smith discloses in an analogous computer system providing a parallel command string to replace the command when it contains sensitive information, prior to it being written to the common log file (page 5, paragraph 44 “a LogEvent call that could potentially put sensitive or personal information into the log file 246, the developer also

includes the "sensitive" flag... the log file is filtered to remove any sensitive data prior to sending the log file to the repository 242").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of the keeping the sensitive information from being logged as taught by Smith into the method of logging a command during the execution time in the log file as taught by Huckins. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to not log the sensitive information to provide security for the user to keep the logging information to be disclosed as suggested by Smith (page 1, paragraph 9).

Claims 7 and 10-12 are the computer program product claim corresponding to method claims 1 and 4-6 respectively, and rejected under the same rationale set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1 and 4-6 respectively, above.

Claims 13 and 15-16 are the system claim corresponding to method claims 1 and 5-6 respectively, and rejected under the same rationale set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1 and 5-6 respectively, above.

8. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huckins in view of US Patent No. 5,892,898 to Fujii et al. (hereinafter called Fujii).

Per claims 2 and 3:

Huckins does not explicitly disclose invoking an error routine that writes a return code of a command to the common log file when the return code is of a certain value.

However, Fujii discloses in an analogous computer system invoking an error routine that writes a return code of a command to the common log file when the return code is of a certain value (col. 4, lines 25-39 "Event logging routine... error information is resident within the subsystem's error message file and can be logged using normal error logging message calls... event logging routine 32 accesses another subsystem's message catalog 40 using its definition table, retrieves the message for the passed event ID from the other subsystem's message catalog 40, and logs the special event ID").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of logging using event logging routine to log error messages differentiated by an ID as taught by Fujii into the method of logging a command during the execution time in the log file as taught by Huckins. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to write the error to the log file to provide a mechanism that identifies the source of a service error and obtains detailed error information at the time the error occurs as suggested by Fujii (col. 1, lines 52-67).

Claims 8 and 9 are the computer program product claim corresponding to method claims 2 and 3 respectively, and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 2 and 3 respectively, above.

Claim 14 is the system claim corresponding to method claim 2 and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 2 above.

Art Unit: 2124

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Satish S. Rampuria** whose telephone number is **703-305-8891**.

The examiner can normally be reached on **8:30 am to 5:00 pm**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Kakali Chaki** can be reached on **(703) 305-9662**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Satish S. Rampuria
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2124
10/04/2004

Kakali Chaki

**KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**